

12 20  
REMARKS

OF THE

HON. JOHN B. HASKIN,

OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NEW YORK,

IN REPLY TO ATTACK MADE BY

THE PRESIDENT'S HOME ORGAN, "THE CONSTITUTION,"

UPON

ANTI-LECOMPTON DEMOCRATS,

AND

COLLOQUY

BETWEEN

MR. LOGAN, OF ILLINOIS, AND MR. HASKIN.

---

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER, 1859.

---

WASHINGTON:

THOMAS MCGILL, PRINTER.

1859.

# REMARKS.

---

The House having under consideration the resolution introduced by Mr. CLARK, of Missouri—

Mr. HASKIN rose and said:

Mr. CLERK: I rise to a personal explanation, and, in order to be as brief possible, I have committed what I desire to say to writing. It was not my intention to take part in any debate which might arise upon this floor previous to the organization of the House, and I would not do so now, were it not for a grossly libelous attack upon me in the home organ of the President on Saturday last. It is not my custom, upon this floor or elsewhere, to notice *little* things, but, as rumor has accorded to the President and his Attorney General Black the editorial management of the Constitution, concealing themselves by the temporary employment of a hireling writer named Browne—not a relative of Ossawatimie Brown, for, though a madman, a fanatic, and a traitor, yet he was a truthful and brave man, I feel that the high authority which supervised and justified the attack made, in the article to which I have alluded, upon the eight anti-Le-compton Democrats of this House, including myself, warrants me in noticing it at this time and in this place. It is unnecessary for me to allude to either President Buchanan or Attorney General Black, as their character is well known to the country; but let me say in relation to this man Browne, who is, I am informed, an alien originally from England, but lately imported into this city by Mr. Buchanan to grind the music from his dolorous organ, that he was previously employed as a penny-a-liner in the city of New York upon the Journal of Commerce, a newspaper started by Lewis Tappan and the original Abolitionists, and which was persuaded to support this Administration by its patronage and the patronage lavished upon it by the merchants who are engaged in the southern trade. During the campaign of 1858, he was induced, as I have reason to believe, by a prominent United States official in the city of New York, to take the stump in opposition to my re-election, and I well recollect that he made a speech in the town of Morrisania, which was reported *in extenso* in one of the New York Administration organs, and the effect of which was to assist to give me two hundred and four majority in that town, an old Democratic town, which regularly gives a majority to any reputable candidate standing upon the Democratic platform. I am confident, sir, that, if he had spoken in the other towns of Westchester county, the result would have been an increased majority for me in each and all of them. It is a fact, recognized throughout the country, that whilst this paper, the Constitution, is the home organ of the President, the New York Herald is Mr. Buchanan's personal exponent.

For the Herald, I can say that, as a newspaper, it has been conducted with an amount of energy and ability which may easily be appreciated by all the members of this House, if they will call to mind the fact that since the Clerk called the roll, the foreshadowings of the Herald as to the policy to be pursued by Administration members have been very accurate.

I beg the asser-

It was that paper that introduced to the notice of the House and country the names of the Republican members who, by their signatures, recommended the circulation of the compend of the *Helper* book. It sounded the key-note of the opposition, which commenced with our assembling here, by the introduction of, in my judgment, the irrelevant resolution of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CLARK;] and it has insisted that there should be no organization of this House by the election as Speaker of any one of those who recommended the circulation of that pamphlet. However much, therefore, I may have heretofore, or may now oppose many of the doctrines advocated in the *Herald*, I cannot withhold from that paper the credit which it deserves for the complete control which it has over the Administration, foreshadowing and directing, not only the policy of Mr. Buchanan and his Cabinet, but the course to be pursued by the members who sustain him upon this floor; and all this, too, notwithstanding its fierce opposition to Mr. Buchanan in 1856, and the support it then yielded to Mr. Fremont and the Republican party.

I desire, Mr. Clerk, in order that the House may understand the character of the charges made by the home organ of the President, that you will read the following article from the Constitution :

[Mr. Haskin sent up to the Clerk an editorial article of over a column in length from the *Washington Constitution* of Saturday last, 9th inst., the whole of which was read to the House. This article charges the eight anti-Lecompton Democrats with being "mercenaries," and Messrs. Haskin and Hickman with having entered into a combination to secure the election of Col. Forney as Clerk, and Mr. Sherman as Speaker.]

Mr. HASKIN. Now, Mr. Clerk, for the charges contained in that article—evidently published "by authority." The first is, that the eight independent anti-Lecompton Democrats upon this floor are mercenaries. In answer to this, let me say that no one in the country knows better than Mr. Buchanan himself the utter falsehood of this charge; for he endeavored by threats and by the seductions of his patronage, without effect, to draw true men away from the path of duty. The second is, that there is a corrupt bargain between the Black Republicans, so-called, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HICKMAN] and myself. I emphatically and indignantly deny this charge. The third declares that I was false to my pledges when I was elected to the Thirty-Fifth Congress. During the campaign, in 1856, which resulted in my election, I made as many speeches as probably any other candidate upon the stump, and in each of them I insisted before my people, that, if elected to Congress, I would not vote for the admission of Kansas as a State into the Union, unless I was satisfied that the constitution under which she applied had been fairly submitted, and fully and fairly ratified by the popular vote. I then declared that I had no compunctions of conscience for or against the admission of a slave State; but that, inasmuch as by the compromise measures of 1850, and the Kansas-Nebraska bill of 1854, Congress had determined upon the doctrine of nonintervention in the affairs of the Territories, in order to localize the question of slavery, and leave it to be decided by the people there, as are other domestic institutions, I stood by that settlement of this exciting question. For that reason I object to the introduction of the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CLARK] which opens the slavery agitation at the thresh-

hold of this Congress, and before this House has organized by the election of its proper officers, and which unnecessarily excites the country throughout its length and breadth. Well, sir; in pursuance of my pledges, and in the performance of my duty as a Representative of the people—free from the control and dictation of the Executive—I did, during the last Congress, do all in my power to prevent the admission of Kansas, under a constitution which every member upon this floor will now concede in no way reflected the will of the majority; but, on the contrary, was the emanation from a small minority of the people of that Territory. I, therefore, deny the charge that I have not lived up to all the pledges that I made in 1856.

Another charge is, that I was actuated in my course during the last Congress toward the Administration by motives of revenge, for the reason that the President had refused to allow me the control of certain Federal patronage. I reply to the President himself, for I judge that this charge was made by his consent and approbation, that I never asked him for the appointment of a single man to office; and that about the only persons I recommended, if I remember rightly, were those whose claims my Democratic colleagues likewise recommended and supported, most of whom were appointed. The President must know that the motive which actuated this charge is as malicious as the charge itself is infamous and void of truth.

It is also charged, Mr. Clerk, that I undertook an investigation at the last Congress which resulted in my discomfiture. I did commence an investigation, under a resolution of the last Congress, into the sale and purchase by the Government, in 1857, of a property upon Long Island Sound, opposite my district, known as Willett's Point, for fortification purposes. Now, for the results, in brief, of that investigation as detailed in the proof before the committee and the reports made to this House. It was proved that the Secretary of War purchased this property for \$200,000, when the appropriation therefor was but \$150,000; and that in this he transcended the power given him to the extent of \$50,000. Now, Mr. Clerk, if the Secretary of War could usurp the rights of the House of Representatives, which has, under the Constitution, the power to originate all bills of supply, and the rights of Congress, and exceed an appropriation to the amount of \$50,000, he certainly could to the amount of \$5,000,000, or even, sir, to the extent of burdening this country by the debt of England, which now almost strangles her commerce and her industry. This was an important discovery of itself, as it showed an unlawful expenditure of the public money; but it was outside of the corruptions which I maintain were incident to the transaction, and which would have warranted Congress in placing its seal of reprobation upon the extravagance and illegal conduct of the Secretary of War. In addition to the fact that the Secretary of War went beyond the appropriation, it was proved that for this property there was paid \$150,000 more than it could have been purchased for a few months previously; and that the broker and personal friend of the Secretary of War, who loaned the money with which this property was purchased by the person who sold it to the Government, and who at the time was discounting the notes of the Secretary to the amount of from ten to twenty thousand dollars, destroyed his check books for the purpose of preventing the ascertainment of facts

which would, in my opinion, have shown the complicity of the Secretary of War and his particular friends in this improper transaction.

Another charge is, that, in 1858, I proceeded home from here and called myself a Democrat—"a Jeffersonian Democrat." It is true that I went home in June, 1858, and called a meeting of the independent people of my district, and allowed my name to be proposed for re-election. I asked them to approve my whole course in Congress, as well in reference to the Willett's Point investigation as to my opposition to the territorial policy of the Administration. I submitted it to the electors of my county, who reside opposite the property known as the Willett's Point purchase, whether I should be sustained on the charges I had made, and the proof I had elicited. What was the verdict? Westchester county, good, honest old Westchester, around which clusters as many revolutionary reminiscences as has any county in the Union, came forward, and, by a majority of one thousand and twenty-two, sustained me over the President's candidate, Gouverneur Kemble, who the President informed me he had done all in his power to nominate and elect, while, at the same time, it gave the Democratic candidate for Governor, Mr. Parker, over twelve hundred majority. If majorities speak intelligently, and in this case I know they do, the fact I state is a sufficient refutation of the charge that the investigation into the sale and purchase of the Willett's Point property had no result.

I plead guilty to the accusation that I announced myself a Democrat upon my return home. I proclaim here that I am a Democrat, a Democrat in essence, in substance, and not in mere form. Democracy, according to my teaching, is the rule of the people under the law; and, let me say to the Administration, that, by its influence and power of patronage, it denied the right of the people to judge for themselves when it urged the adoption of the Leecompton constitution. It was in reference to the admission of Kansas into the Union as a State, and the protection of the rights of the people of that Territory, that I declared here that the anti-Leecompton men were Democrats. I made this declaration in opposition to the Federal doctrines to which Mr. Buchanan has in his old age returned, and under which he sought to force, with Federal power and patronage, a State into the Union with a constitution repugnant to its people, and in defiance of the protest of its Legislature. This was an unsuccessful attempt, it would appear, to gratify the South by the introduction of another slave State and the addition to their political power of two Senators.

And, Mr. Clerk, just here I will say a word or two in reply to the remarks made by the distinguished and courteous gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. SMITH,] who in his colloquy with my colleague, [Mr. CLARK,] stated that he determined his Democracy by his vote upon the Democratic caucus nominee. I take issue with him. With me, organization, especially under this Administration, is an instrument of tyranny and proscription. Whoever is the Speaker, it is within the power of a majority of the House to control his action. Yet sometimes the Speaker has abused the discretion intrusted to his hands. There was a memorable instance in the last session. After days of conflict, the House, by deliberate vote, in response to the unmistakable wish of the country, determined that there should be an investigation into the affairs in Kansas, but the Speaker, with whom the discretion was left to appoint the committee, in my judgment, selected, contrary to all parliamentary precedent, a majority of the

committee from the enemies of that investigation, and from those who had upon the record solemnly voted against it, so that all inquiry was effectually defeated. I deny that organization here is the test of my Democracy, or of that of any man in this land. The only body I recognize as capable, in a party sense, of declaring the principles which are to guide me as a Democrat is the national Democratic convention. I recognize the resolutions and platform of the last national Democratic convention which assembled at Cincinnati, in 1856. I hold that those resolutions embody the precepts of our faith. No congressional caucus, and no Administration party vote upon the floor of this House, upon any measure which the President may recommend, can unmake my Democracy or force me to forsake the pledges I made, in 1856, to support the Cincinnati platform. Adhesion to congressional caucuses, we know, has for years been an exploded idea. I insist, whenever an organization deserts the principles upon which its representatives were elected, it acts treasonably toward the party, and is not deserving of respect. For example: suppose I were a Presbyterian, and the minister of my church should, from the pulpit, begin to preach the diabolical doctrines of the Thugs of India, would I be obliged to leave the Christian religion and follow him in his apostasy? No, sir, I would continue to follow the cross of our Saviour, as I have continued to abide by the creed of our party pronounced at Cincinnati. The organization of the Democratic party must be subordinate to principle, and not principle to organization; and the doctrine that organization is paramount to principle is a political heresy that the people of the United States have rejected, and will indignantly reject in the future. I have been surprised, sir, to see strict constructionists of the South, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN] especially, insisting with this effete Administration upon the infallibility of organization.

I am accused in addition by The Constitution with having called upon my Black Republican friend Greeley, and having entered into an arrangement by which he was to yield me his support. I assert, in respect to this gentleman that, until after the adjournment of the first session of the Thirty-fifth Congress, I never corresponded or spoke with him. His paper nevertheless sustained my course during the whole of my opposition to the Lecompton policy of the Administration, as it had also generously and ably sustained the course of Judge DOUGLAS on that question. I never had any understanding with him in my life. He came to my support, as he came to the support of Mr. DAVIS of Indiana, Messrs. ADRAIN and RIGGS of New Jersey, Messrs. HICKMAN and SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, and Messrs. CLARK and REYNOLDS of New York, and to the support of Mr. McKibbin, who warred so bravely for principle in California, but who had at last to yield before the myriads of office-holders in that State. He came to our support, not that he expected us to act with his party in the future, but to justify and sustain each one of us for acting like honest men in vindicating the pledges upon which we had been elected. I am not one of those who feel insensible to the able and the patriotic support which the New York Tribune gave to each of us in the eventful contest of 1858. Mr. Greeley is my constituent, and although I differ with him in principle, yet from my knowledge of the man, I take pride in saying upon this floor that he is undoubtedly honest in his views, and that, wherever he is known, no man questions his sincerity or his veracity. He supported me knowing

me to be a Democrat and with a full knowledge of my views in favor of popular sovereignty, as explained by Judge DOUGLAS in his interpretation of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and as enunciated by the President himself in his letter of acceptance, where he declared that the people of a Territory, *like those of a State*, should decide the question of their domestic institutions for themselves. Each and every one of the gentlemen who have been abused and stigmatized as mercenaries by the home organ of the President, were supported by the Tribune for election, or re-election, upon the same ground that it sustained me, with a full knowledge that they differed with Mr. Greeley in respect to congressional intervention for the prohibition of slavery in the Territories, as they differed with southern gentlemen who favored congressional intervention for the protection of slavery in the Territories.

The Constitution further alleges that I am for the election of Colonel John W. Forney, of Pennsylvania, to the Clerkship of this House, to secure which a bargain has been entered into between his friends and the Republicans. I deny this combination, whilst I confess that I am the friend of Colonel Forney for Clerk. There is no man throughout the length and breadth of this country whose election would more completely rebuke this Administration for its departure from Democratic principles, its treachery to pledges made in 1856, its extravagance, its proscriptions, and the virulence of its federalism, than that of Colonel John W. Forney. I am for his election, because it would be the vindication by the people of an honest statesman against the arrogance and tyranny of an Administration of which he was the Warwick. In him we have beheld one, who as an editor, has sustained each and all of us as independent Democrats, in our districts; and who, as an orator of signal power, has carried conviction by the force of his reason and his eloquence. I remember that he went into the district of my colleague, [Mr. CLARK,] and there made a speech in his support, which was both brilliant and effective. I cannot forget that he was, upon several occasions, in the districts of my friends from New Jersey [Messrs. ADRAIN and RIGGS] doing good service in their behalf. I would not, if I could, forget that he did the same thing for me in my district, at Tarrytown; and that in Pennsylvania, he was in the districts of Messrs. SCHWARTZ and HICKMAN, battling nobly and successfully for the right.

And, sir, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that he, more than any other man, gave the State of Pennsylvania to Mr. Buchanan in 1856; and that he, in 1858, more than all other men combined, placed the seal of condemnation of that old Commonwealth upon James Buchanan, its once favorite son, by a majority of over seventy thousand of the popular vote, as shown in the election of Representatives to Congress now on this floor. For these eminent services, rendered in a righteous cause, not referring to his extraordinary capabilities for the position which he has already honorably held, I plead guilty to the charge that it is nearest my heart, in the organization of this House, to see Col. Forney selected as its Clerk.

Now, sir, for the gist of this article, which is an attempted defense of the Administration from the effect of my charges in the debate between the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN] and myself. I then charged that it had been extravagant and corrupt. The Admini-

tration organ denies the charge, and challenges me to the proof. When this becomes an organized House, I trust that among the first things done will be the selection of investigating committees to expose to the country still further grounds for that charge than those which have been already published. This is no time or place to get to that work. Let me say, generally, that when this Administration came into power, there was in the Treasury a surplus of about twenty million dollars, and that notwithstanding that, we were asked at the assembling of the first session of the Thirty-Fifth Congress to vote \$20,000,000 in Treasury notes, in order that the Government might be carried on. At the session following we were asked to vote another \$20,000,000. The expense of this Administration of the Government for the last fiscal year was about eighty million dollars, one-third larger than under any previous Administration. Staring us in the face is the startling fact that in two years the War Department alone has asked appropriations exceeding in amount what was required by that Department, when under Mr. Marcy, during the Mexican war. No corruption, Mr. Clerk, in the sale of the Fort Snelling property for, I think, \$90,000, at the time when it was generally believed to be worth \$200,000! That property, we know, went into the hands of the immediate and confidential friends of the Secretary of War. No corruption in the purchase of land for fortification purposes, at New Bedford, for which sixty-eight or seventy thousand dollars were paid, when it could have been obtained a short time before for one-fourth of that amount! That property was purchased just previous to its sale to the government by the friends of the Secretary of War, and by them sold to the United States. No corruption in the Utah war contracts for the transportation of supplies to the Army! No corruption in the mule contracts! No corruption in the purchase of extravagantly high-priced ships for the useless expedition to Paraguay, an expedition which has cost the Government millions, and resulted in rendering it ridiculous forever! No corruption in the division of the coal agency, made, I believe, for the purpose of returning the President's favorite, J. Glancy Jones, from Berks county, against the old Jackson Democrat who sits near me, [Mr. SCHWARTZ,] and in the face of an outraged and indignant constituency! No corruption in the bestowal of the printing of the Post Office blanks, as has been charged, and I believe nowhere denied! No corruption there, where it is alleged the contract was given to Mr. Rice, of the Philadelphia Pennsylvanian, with a view of supporting that paper, and the Union, *alias* the Constitution, as well as the Evening Argus, of Philadelphia! No corruption in the employment of extra hands in immense numbers in the Philadelphia and Brooklyn navy-yards just prior to the elections, and their dismissal immediately afterward! Why, sir, it is well known throughout the North that this has been the most extravagant and corrupt administration of Government which the world has seen since the days of Walpole. So glaring were these extravagancies and corruptions, that during the last Congress, in which the Democrats had a working majority, the power was taken from the Secretary of War, after mature deliberation, to sell the Government reservations, and from the Secretary of the Navy the power of appointing agents for the purchase of coal for the Navy, and throwing coal supplies open to the lowest bidder by contract! If the Administration members will permit a speedy organization of this House, these



matters can be all looked into, I know, with beneficial results to the country.

Having thus replied to the specific charges contained in the Constitution, permit me now to briefly give to the House my views in relation to its proceedings since the Clerk called the roll on Monday last. We were elected to organize this body, and to proceed with the legitimate business of the country. The adjournment of the Thirty-Fifth Congress without the passage of the appropriation bill for the support of the Post Office Department, has compelled that Department to proceed with the postal arrangements of the country, without money to pay for them, and under contracts based upon the honor of this Government to promptly meet them on the assembling of the present Congress. The contractors under this Department since Monday last have been suffering for the lack of means with which to supply their wants, and to perform their engagements. The Administration, through its representatives upon this floor, immediately upon the roll being called, commenced here an agitation upon the negro question by the introduction of the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri. This subject might have been considered with order and decorum when the House organized; and it is, in my opinion, clearly out of place at present, under the circumstances surrounding us. So far as the resolution is concerned, I would suggest that it would have been just as fair and proper for me, or any other member, to have offered a resolution, provided John Letcher, the present Governor elect of Virginia, had been a member of this House and the candidate of the Administration for Speaker, proclaiming that, inasmuch as he once, in a letter to Mr. Rufner, declared that slavery was a "a social and political evil," he was, therefore, unfit to be the Speaker of this House. Sir, that resolution had nothing legitimately to do with the business of the country, or of this House. As well might a resolution have been introduced that, because somebody signed a circular, favoring the use of Mrs. Pease's hoarhound candy, as Clay and Webster once did, therefore, such a recommendation unfitted the person so recommending it for becoming Speaker. Its introduction has aroused feelings in this House which should never have been called up here, and scenes have been witnessed upon the floor which have disgraced this deliberative body in the eyes of the whole country, and of the civilized world.

Mr. Clerk, I have heard upwards of a dozen speeches already from gentlemen of the South, proclaiming secession doctrines, in certain contingencies, which doctrines have been applauded by the galleries, in this southern city, where large numbers of the men who daily fill them reside—the employés and recipients of Government money. They are, it seems, paid the people's money to appear here and insult their Representatives. The members from the free States have come here, expecting to enjoy the hospitality for which the South has alwas been celebrated, and not such treatment as this. I have not heard from this side one single speech or sentiment which has not breathed devotion to the Constitution and the Union, and a determination to faithfully maintain and protect the South in all of her constitutional rights. I was pleased, on Saturday last, when the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. MILES] announced his devotion to his own State, and proclaimed that, in that sense, he was a sectional man. In the same sense, I proclaim my devotion to the great interests of New York, the Empire State of the Union, whose commerce

penetrates every part of the world. I am proud to avow on this floor that I am a northern man ; but as a northern man, it is my desire to stand up here and proclaim that I am a brother of the southern man. This is a compact between coequal States, and I am in favor of respecting and protecting the local laws, and of sustaining each State in all its constitutional privileges in this House. I heard, with the blood tingling through my veins, the patriotic speech of the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. NELSON,] in which he offered his devotion to the Union. In common with him, the Representatives from the free States do the same thing ; but it must not be expected that we will sit here and listen to the gentlemen on this floor charge aggression on the part of the North, without stating that it has its rights to be maintained, as well as the rights of the South. I cannot forget that out of the taxation received by the Government, three-fourths of the expenses of the postal service of the country are paid by the people of the free States. I cannot forget that over one-half of the patronage of this Government is concentrated among inhabitants and citizens of southern States. I cannot forget that the Army and Navy have had more than their just quota of representatives from the southern States. Yet I do not complain, although, the other day, I heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DAVIS] proclaim that they would hang all of us North who were suspected of want of devotion to southern interests, and take possession of the Army and Navy. To that I say, "Who is afraid?" Would it not have been in better taste to have said the Army and Navy should be used, if necessary, for the purpose of preserving the Union and sustaining the principles which underlie its foundation? Would it not have been better to have insisted that, in case of an invasion of Virginia by fanatics from the North, the East, or the West, that the Army should be called out by the Executive to crush it, and that the same power should be exerted in case of an invasion from the South, or any other section into a northern State? These violent denunciations, threatening us of the North, who have the numerical strength, are productive of prejudice, and are creating feelings which, I fear, may not be allayed.

Sir, when I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRAWFORD] assert, several days ago, in substance, that he was not in favor of any more Castle Garden Union-saving meetings for the purpose of protecting the rights of the South, I felt gratified. We have had recent exhibitions of this kind in Philadelphia and Boston. It is not those who get up such meetings who will defend your rights, gentlemen of the South, in the North. The South itself is capable and must vindicate its own rights, joined by the whole conservative body of the North, with which I rank myself as ready on any legitimate occasion to take up arms to protect her. Sir, those Union meetings are too frequently controlled by scheming politicians and selfish merchants. It is one of the clap-trap schemes of the day for advertising men and merchandise, and many who engage in them know less of the constitutional questions arising in this body and the general politics of the country than the mechanics and laboring men throughout the free States. If you rely upon them, you rely on the sordid interests of men—of those who will not do what the conservative body of the people from the rural districts from which I come would do in case of necessity.

Mr. Clerk, let me indulge in a few words in relation to this reckless

raid of old John Brown. I do not believe that there are one thousand men in all the free States who justify his act of treason. The people of the North desired to see the laws of the country executed, and I heard no one object to hanging him. There were, however, many who admired his deportment from the time of his arrest to the time of his execution, and the bravery with which he met his final end. Some sympathy may have been felt for the man, but none for his act. And here I would ask whether there are not men in the South who are accountable for setting bad examples. I allude to those who last Congress justified General Walker and his men in their invasion of Nicaragua, a country with which we were then at peace. Do gentlemen upon the other side of the House justify those who met in southern convention and proclaimed themselves in favor of reopening the African slave trade, in opposition to the compromises of the Constitution? Do gentlemen upon the other side justify the landing of a cargo of slaves, by the Wanderer, upon the southern coast of the United States—an act which set at defiance the law declaring the slave trade piracy? While there are gentlemen South entertaining such extreme views, is it to be wondered at, considering the numerical superiority of the North, that there should be found fanatics there! Transplant Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, Parker Pillsbury, and such men, South, and you would make them fire-eaters, and take the fire-eaters of the South into Massachusetts, and very likely they would prove fanatics against slavery. We of the anti-Lecompton legion, together with the patriotic South Americans, who were with us last Congress in our struggle, are against the extremists of both sections of the Confederacy. We design to maintain the Constitution and the laws as they have been handed down to us by our fathers.

Now, a word or two in relation to the party position I occupy, speaking for myself. I have been re-elected to this Congress as an independent man. There are eight of us, all told, who can say the same thing, viz: JOHN G. DAVIS of Indiana, Major SCHWARTZ and JOHN HICKMAN of Pennsylvania; Messrs. ADRAIN and RIGGS of New Jersey; and Messrs. CLARK, REYNOLDS, and myself, of New York. Each and all of us were elected over organization, especially over the Administration organization, in our districts. We come here, if I may be permitted to speak for all of us, occupying positions in this Congress similar to those occupied by Roebuck, Hume, Bright, and Milner Gibson, in the British Parliament; who, when the Government is right, vote with it, and when it is wrong, vote against it. This is our position, so far as this Administration is concerned. We are conservative men, desirous of representing our constituencies to the full extent of our ability, and at the same time feeling that elected as we have been, we are—

—“pledged to no party's arbitrary sway,  
But follow truth where'er it leads the way.”

The difference between the anti-Lecompton men of this House and the Republicans is upon the vital question before the country—the territorial policy of the Administration. The Republicans, in their party platform, insist upon congressional intervention to prohibit the extension of the domestic institution of slavery into the Territories. That was the doctrine of John Van Buren and all those who supported the Buffalo platform of

1848. Many southern men are now advocating congressional intervention to protect the domestic institution of slavery in the Territories. The anti-Lecomptonites take the middle and sound Democratic ground of legitimate popular sovereignty in the organized Territories of the Union. They insist that, by the legislation of 1850, when the Republicans opposed the extension of the Missouri line to the Pacific, and by the legislation of 1854, in the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, it was designed that Congress should not intervene for or against slavery; but that the people of the Territories, through their Legislatures, or through their constitutional conventions, might pass upon this question, as upon all others of domestic concernment. There is a direct antagonism between us and the Republicans upon that question; and there is also a direct antagonism between us and certain southern gentlemen upon that question. Notwithstanding this, it is a fact to be commended, that the Republicans, at the last session, with a practical good sense for which they deserve to be commended, put themselves, by their votes, squarely upon the doctrine of popular sovereignty, as contained in the Crittenden-Montgomery bill, and acted with the anti-Lecomptonites in exposing the corruption and extravagance of the Administration, as did also some of those patriotic gentlemen known as southern Americans. There is more sympathy between us than I can feel for the Administration men, who opposed us in everything during the last Congress; and I am therefore, if necessary, willing to join the general opposition to the policy and measures of this Administration, in the past as well as the future, in the speedy organization of this House, so that the legitimate business of the country may be proceeded with.

A word or two, Mr. Clerk, in relation to the proscriptions of this Administration, and its opposition to the Democracy of Illinois, and the independent Democrats outside of that State on this floor, and I conclude. I desire that the country shall understand that I approve the principles of Judge DOUGLAS. I sustained him throughout his gallant fight during the whole of the last Congress against the territorial policy of this Administration, and I sympathize with him now in the position which he occupies in his own State, acting there within the regular forms of the organization. I can safely assert that he has sympathized with and justified the independent Democrats who have been elected to this House for the course which they pursued in their several districts. I say this because the Administration in his own State set the example of disorganization by the expatriation of the regular candidates of the party, and the running of stump candidates against them, putting Black Republicans, so called, in office, and removing from office all men who sympathized with Judge DOUGLAS. Recognizing, as I do, State sovereignty in the affairs of politics, I claim the right to insist upon a proper amount of respect to district sovereignty, which, through the will of the majority of the people, elected each of us anti-Lecompton Democrats to this House. The most of us represent three elements of the political parties of the day—the Republican, the American, and the anti-Lecompton Democratic element. We could not forget if we would the respect which is due to each of these elements for coming to our support, and sustaining us against the proscriptions of the federal power; and we could not, or at least I could not, stultify myself by voting upon the organization of this House for an Administration candidate for the Speakership, to whose election I am satisfied a majority of my

constituents are opposed. Self-respect, if no other consideration, will prevent me assisting to elect an Administration candidate for Speaker of this House. I desire to be thus explicit, because the country should know the position of each of us independent men upon this floor.

In conclusion, Mr. Clerk, let me say that it is susceptible of the clearest proof that Mr. Buchanan is responsible for the demoralization of the Democratic party, and the resuscitation of the Republican party. In the belief that his pledges of justice to the people of Kansas would be fulfilled, and that the people there, under the territorial organization given to them by Congress, should for themselves decide in reference to their own domestic institutions, succeeding the presidential election, the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Indiana, elected Democratic State officers by triumphant majorities. At the Thirty-Fifth Congress, one hundred and twenty-eight members of Congress were returned to this House who voted for Mr. Orr as the Democratic nominee for Speaker. Immediately Mr. Buchanan developed his territorial policy, forced Governor Walker to resign, and urged the acceptance of the Lecompton constitution, then the Republican party lifted up its head, and the Democratic party, under the load put upon it by this Administration, went down into the dust before the indignation of an outraged people. There are here, at this Thirty-Sixth Congress, one hundred and thirteen gentlemen claimed as Republicans, and there have been accessions from the South to the ranks of the Opposition to this Administration, and losses, of course, to the ranks of the latter; and, sir, we have of late seen the Democratic conventions in the free States throwing overboard this Jonah, who, if kept in our midst, must sink our ship, and adopting platforms in direct antagonism to the territorial policy of this Administration. In most of them delegates have been chosen to Charleston in favor of Senator DOUGLAS, the champion of popular sovereignty. All these things are attributable to the extravagance and faithlessness in pledges of this Administration; and, sir, the Democratic party need not expect to succeed in 1860 unless it ignores this Administration altogether.

### COLLOQUY BETWEEN HASKIN AND LOGAN.

Mr. LOGAN. So far as the Democratic candidate for Speaker is concerned, I have never asked him a question, for God knows the subject never entered my mind. I came here to vote for whoever the Democratic party should put in nomination for Speaker. I have entire confidence in the impartiality of that gentleman who is the nominee of the Democratic party. I have confidence in him because he comes from the land of Washington, Jefferson, Madison—from a land of patriots; and I believe that no man coming from that land could act in such a manner as to infringe upon the rights of any portion of this Union. [Applause.]

Mr. HASKIN. Will the gentleman permit me to put an interrogatory to him?

Mr. LOGAN. That is owing to its character. [Laughter.]

Mr. HASKIN. The gentleman from Illinois has stated that he intended to support the nominee of the Charleston Convention.

Mr. LOGAN. I have.

Mr. HASKIN. If the Charleston Convention adopt a platform in op-

position to the views of Judge Douglas, as expressed in his essay, published in *Harper's Magazine*, and endorsing and approving the conduct of the Administration, as well upon other matters as upon its Kansas policy, will the gentleman from Illinois then support the nominee of that Convention.

Mr. LOGAN. I will answer the gentleman's question. I am now about twenty-eight years of age. I was born a Democrat, and all my life I have learned to believe that the Democratic party, in National Convention, never do wrong. [Applause and laughter from the Democratic benches and the galleries.] I have never known the Democratic party, in National Convention, to endorse a platform that was not consistent with my views. Having that confidence in the party, I do not go ahead, and I will not say what I will do. Having confidence in that Convention, I will vote for the nominee of that Convention.

Mr. HASKIN. Anyhow?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HASKIN. I will not. Does the gentleman believe with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, whose nomination he is desirous of securing from the Charleston Convention, and whom I sustained throughout his glorious fight against this Administration, as well upon its Kansas policy as upon its startling corruptions, which, in the last House, I endeavored to expose to the country—does the gentleman from Illinois believe with the Senator from his State that an organized Territorial Government, like that of Kansas, can exclude or abolish slavery from its borders?

Mr. LOGAN. I will answer the gentleman's questions in this way.

Mr. HASKIN. No dodging. Let us put ourselves squarely upon the record.

Mr. LOGAN. I profess to be a Democrat. I do not recognise such a distinction as anti-Lecompton or Lecompton Democrat, but denominate all as Democrats. I have said already that I have buried past issues. I have done with them. Ignoring them, I say then that I am a Democrat without a prefix to my name. I am for Stephen A. Douglas for the next President of the United States—first, last, and all the time. If he is not nominated, I am for the next man—that is, sir, the man who is nominated. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. HASKIN. If the Charleston Convention adopt a resolution in its platform that Congress shall protect slave property in the organized Territories of the United States where the people are opposed to it, will the gentleman from Illinois then support the nominees of that Convention?

Mr. LOGAN. Let me say to my friend from New York to wait until the Democratic platform is adopted. When it is adopted, and we have seen it, is the time to say what we will do. Let us meet and embrace one another as brothers. Let us come together, strike hands, and bury past differences. Let us meet upon a common platform. Let us be united in our action to defeat the Republicans and to elect a Democratic Speaker. [Applause.]

Mr. HASKIN. Let me, in reply to that proposition, say a few words. At the last session of Congress, the Republican members of this House put themselves squarely upon the anti-Lecompton platform—the same platform which Judge Douglas supported. By voting for the Crittenden-Montgomery bill, they gave up their antiquated doctrine of no

more slave States. I am one of those, sir, who came here, into this hall from an independent constituency. I came here with no party collar upon my neck. Nor, sir, am I a believer in the doctrine that if my enemy smite me upon the right cheek that I shall turn my left to him to be again struck. [Applause upon the floor and in the galleries.] I am, and have been, in favor of the speedy organization of this House. I am, and have been, opposed to the rambling debate that has been going on for days. And, Mr. Clerk, let me say that I hold in abhorrence the appeals made to me by gentlemen of the other side—to me, an independent anti-Lecompton Democrat, to come to the support of the infamous policy of the Administration in reference to the admission of Kansas, by supporting a Lecompton Administration Democrat for the Speaker. [Applause upon the floor and in the galleries.] For myself, I will never vote in this House for any man for Speaker who voted for the Lecompton policy of this administration, or who approves of its proscriptions and corruption; [renewed applause;] nor will I vote for any man who sustains the party proscriptions in Illinois, about which the gentlemen upon the floor from that State must certainly know something.

A MEMBER. Will the gentleman vote for a Republican?

Mr. HASKIN. I will vote for any gentleman from this side of the House who comes nearer to my platform than the gentlemen of the other side who voted for the Lecompton policy of this Administration. [Applause.] I came here determined to do all within my power to prevent the organization of this House by the election of an Administration candidate. [Renewed applause.] Is that explicit enough?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, sir. All I have to say in reply is, that I came here as a Democrat, and I expect to support a Democrat. I may have differed with gentlemen upon this side of the House in reference to laws that are passed; but God knows that I have differed from the other side from my childhood, and with that side I will never affiliate as long as I have breath in my body. [Applause.]

Mr. HASKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois and to the House that, if this side of the House affiliate with me and the anti-Lecompton Democrats, I will be most happy to receive their support and affiliation.

Mr. BARKSDALE. The gentleman has left the Democratic party for the party's good, and we are glad to be rid of him.

Mr. HASKIN. I am not under any obligation to the Administration party of this House. As an independent Representative in the last Congress, my action has been approved by my constituency. I was elected as the Administration candidate who ran against me. If the Republican party will put itself upon the popular-sovereignty platform; if it will come to the conclusion that the Legislative Assembly of a Territory can abolish slavery, as Judge Douglas has proclaimed it can in his *Harper's Essay*; if it will go to work and expose to the country, as I hope it will upon the organization of the House, the infamous extravagance and the gross corruption of the Administration; if it will put itself upon our platform, then I would sooner co-operate with that party than with those who have, for the first time in the history of the country, raised an issue upon a fraudulent Constitution and endeavored to force a slave State into the Union under it. [Applause.]